

**REMARKS**

In the July 12, 2007 Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the July 12, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record and added new claims 45-63 as indicated above. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1 and 45-63 are pending, with claims 1 and 59 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In paragraphs 1-4 of the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,768,827 to Musgrove (hereinafter "Musgrove patent"), U.S. Patent No. 6,109,686 to Fox (hereinafter "Fox patent") or EP Publication No. 0 516 495 to Trosseille (hereinafter "Trosseille publication"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, independent claim 1 now recites a child seat assembly including a ***handle*** movably mounted to move relative to the back rest part of the child seat assembly between ***a handle-stowed position to laterally restrict movement of a child's head*** in an event of a side-vehicle impact and a carrying position to enable convenient carrying of the child seat assembly when the child seat assembly is removed from the vehicle seat assembly, the handle being generally horse-shoe shaped to form lateral restraining members ***extending directly from the back rest part*** of the child seat assembly and that are ***directly exposed to the***

*child seating area* when in the handle-stowed position. Clearly, this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Musgrove patent, the Fox patent, the Trosseille publication or any other prior art of record.

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose *each* and *every* element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

#### *New Claims*

Applicants have added new dependent claims 45-58 by the current Amendment, which directly or indirectly depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, these dependent claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above regarding independent claim 1.

Applicants have also added new independent claim 59 and dependent claims 60-63 by the current amendment, which directly or indirectly depend from independent claim 59. Independent claim 59 recites a *handle* movably mounted to move relative to the back rest part between *a handle-stowed position to laterally restrict movement of a child's head* in an event of a side-vehicle impact and a carrying position to enable convenient carrying of the child seat assembly when the child seat assembly is removed from the vehicle seat assembly, the handle being generally horse-shoe shaped to form lateral restraining members *extending directly from the back rest part* of the child seat assembly and that are *directly exposed to the child seating area* when in the handle-stowed position.

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose *each* and *every* element of the claim within the reference. Therefore,

Appl. No. 10/552,577  
Amendment dated October 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 12, 2007

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 59 is not anticipated by the prior art of record.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claims 60-63 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 59, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, dependent claims 60-63 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate independent claim 59, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Accordingly new claims 45-63 are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above.

***Prior Art Citation***

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 45-63 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ David L. Tarnoff /  
David L. Tarnoff  
Reg. No. 32,383

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: October 2, 2007  
S:\10-OCT07-MLB\NS-US055234 Amendment.doc